

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the pre-appeal conference, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 2 includes "shared title". The claimed "shared title" is not found in the specification and unclear as to what the shared title includes.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the shared file" in line 3, 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2167

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-7,13-14,19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams ("Adams") in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson ("Hanson") and US 2003/0087629 issued to David Juitt et al ("Juitt").

As per claim 1, Adams teaches a method for fulfilling a file-sharing query (abstract), comprising:
providing a user interface (UI) to a querying user, the UI for entering a query to a metadata repository (see paragraph 18-19, Adams' central index server is taught in a manner similar to the claimed metadata repository, user entering a search request);
receiving a query from the querying user via the UI, the shared file satisfying the query based on the stored metadata (paragraph 19, transferring the search request to the central index server);

Art Unit: 2167

and transmitting an identification of the shared file to the querying user (paragraph 20, central index server providing the file name, file type and the category which the file is located and the file location).

Adams does not explicitly teach transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user. Hanson does teach transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user (paragraph 47, paragraph 65, lines 1-5, metadata associated with content such as content name, content owner and user interface to allow user to become a provider) and at [0023], as purchasing side user interface, [0027], as program modules may be located in both local and remote computer storage media and client nodes may behave as server nodes, [0070], each user computer may function with some, or all or none of the DMCHP functionality and the purchasing side UI may be provided in a distributed manner in user computers to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and

ensure content owners receive benefits as described by Hanson (see summary).

Adams does not explicitly teach bandwidth being allocated to the file-sharing user at a first level and wherein the bandwidth is allocated to the querying user at a second level lower than a first level. Juitt does teach this limitation at [0020], as once a role is assigned to the user, the user's bandwidth capacity is limited according to the assigned role. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adams and Hanson with bandwidth being allocated to the file-sharing user at a first level and wherein the bandwidth is allocated to the querying user at a second level lower than a first level to allow substantial control to be gained over the network access as described by Juitt [0009].

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches: said client-side application generating the metadata using an abstracting program (paragraph 49 and 67-68, purchasing side User Interface to and downloading a requested file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

Art Unit: 2167

said UI comprising a proprietary UI of the metadata repository (paragraph 18-19, as transferring user search request to central index server).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

said transmitting an identification further comprising: transmitting a hyperlink to the querying user in response to the query, wherein a selection of the hyperlink by the querying user initiates a transmission of the shared file from the file-sharing user to the querying user (paragraphs 21-23, user selecting link to file from search results list and downloading to the client terminal).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising: storing the shared file locally based on a characteristic of the shared file (paragraph 52).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

said transmitting an identification further comprising: transmitting a hyperlink to the querying user in response to the query, wherein a selection of the hyperlink by the querying user initiates a transmission of the shared file from the metadata repository to the querying user (paragraph 15, lines 21-23 and paragraph 21-23, link to file identified in the search).

As per claim 13, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches:

Art Unit: 2167

The method of claim 1, further comprising: providing a payment to the file-sharing user for the shared file transmitted to the querying user (paragraph 65 and paragraph 68, facilitating payment to the rights owner).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches:

The method of claim 13, further comprising: receiving a payment from the querying user for the shared file (paragraph 65, purchasing side provides for purchasing content, and paragraph 65 for facilitating payment to rights owner).

As per claim 19 Adams teaches:

receiving a query from a user in the searching class, the metadata satisfying the query (paragraphs 18-19, transferring the search request to the central index server);

and providing an identification of the shared file to the user in the searching class (paragraph 20, central index server providing the file name, file type and the category which the file is located and the file location).

Adams does not explicitly teach establishing at least two classes of users that interact with a metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data and a searching class that primarily searches for data and receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class. Hanson does teach establishing at least two classes

Art Unit: 2167

of users that interact with a metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data (paragraph 65, selling side) and a searching class that primarily searches for data (paragraph 40, user a);

receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class (paragraphs 47, 65) to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with establishing at least two classes of users that interact with a metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data, a searching class that primarily searches for data, and receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits as described by Hanson (see summary).

Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach higher levels of network resources are allocated to the sharing class than to the searching class. Juitt does teach these limitations Adams does not explicitly teach bandwidth being allocated to the file-sharing user at a first level and wherein the bandwidth is allocated to the querying user at a second level lower than a first level. Juitt does teach this limitation at [0020], as once a role is assigned to the user, the user's bandwidth capacity is limited according to the assigned role. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adams and Hanson with higher levels of network resources are

Art Unit: 2167

allocated to the sharing class than to the searching class to allow substantial control to be gained over the network access as described by Juitt [0009].

As per claim 20, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

: uploading the shared file from the user in the sharing class for distribution to users in the searching class when the shared file satisfies a predetermined condition (paragraphs 21-23, user selecting file from search results list and downloading to the client terminal).

Claims 2, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams and Hanson and Juitt in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0143976 issued to Reed A. Barker et al ("Barker").

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson and Juitt do not explicitly teach periodically receiving and storing updated metadata from the client-side application. Barker does teach periodically receiving and storing updated metadata from the client-side application (paragraph 28) to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph 7, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Adams and Hanson and Juitt with periodically receiving and storing updated metadata from the client-side application to allow a

Art Unit: 2167

content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata as described by Barker (paragraph 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson and Juitt do not explicitly teach wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage. Barker does teach explicitly teach wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage (paragraphs 8, 28, asset provider manages metadata and distributes metadata and update metadata and metadata storage device locator) to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata as described by Barker. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Adams and Hanson and Juitt with wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata as described by Barker (paragraph 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson and Juitt do not explicitly teach receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata

Art Unit: 2167

repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository.

Barker does teach receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository (paragraph 28, retrieve updated metadata) to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph 7, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Adams and Hanson and Juitt with receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata as described by Barker (paragraph 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Barker teaches: said transmitting the updated metadata further comprising: transmitting the updated metadata in a parallel, pair wise protocol with the at least one other metadata repository (paragraph 8, distribute updated metadata).

Claims 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams and Hanson and Juitt in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0015574 issued to Steven L. Seed et al ("Seed").

As per claim 8, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson and Juitt do not explicitly teach the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file. Seed does teach the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file (paragraph 44) to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson and Juitt with the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file to reduce network congestion as described by (paragraph 10, lines 20-21).

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Adams and Hanson and Juitt in view US Patent Application Publication 2003/0217152 issued to David J. Kasper II ("Kasper").

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson and Juitt do not explicitly teach periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository. Kasper does teach periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository (paragraphs 20-21, 48-50) to update local databases (paragraph 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson

Art Unit: 2167

and Juitt with periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository to update local databases as described by Kasper (paragraph 24).

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams and Hanson and US 2003/0087629 issued to David Juitt et al ("Juitt") in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0015574 issued to Steven L. Seed et al ("Seed") in view of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0217152 issued to David J. Kasper II ("Kasper").

As per claim 15 Adams teaches:

A method for facilitating file-sharing queries (see abstract), comprising:
storing the metadata locally at a first metadata repository to facilitate search queries from querying users received by the first metadata repository (paragraph 20, central index).

Adams does not explicitly teach receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files. Hanson does teach receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files (paragraph 47 and paragraph 65, lines 1-5) and at [0042], as user a can set price to download digital content, [0043], digital rights owner may chose to set different prices for different users for example high traffic high quality providers, Figure 2, reference number 210 : metadata repository to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary). It would have been

Art Unit: 2167

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary).

Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold and periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories. Seed does teach uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold (paragraph 44, lines 1-4 to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson with uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21).

Adams, Hanson and Seed do not explicitly teach periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories. Kasper does teach periodically synchronizing stored metadata with

Art Unit: 2167

a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories (paragraphs 20-21, 48-50) to update local databases from master databases (paragraph 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Hanson and Seed with periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories) to update local databases from master databases (paragraph 24).

Adams, Hanson, Seed and Kasper do not explicitly teach bandwidth being allocated to the file-sharing user at a first level and wherein the bandwidth is allocated to the querying user at a second level lower than a first level. Juitt does teach this limitation at [0020], as once a role is assigned to the user, the user's bandwidth capacity is limited according to the assigned role. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adams and Hanson, Seed, Kasper with bandwidth being allocated to the file-sharing user at a first level and wherein the bandwidth is allocated to the querying user at a second level lower than a first level to allow substantial control to be gained over the network access as described by Juitt [0009].

As per claim 16, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 15, wherein the queries received by the metadata repository are not transmitted to the second metadata repository and queries

Art Unit: 2167

received by the second metadata repository are not transmitted to the first metadata repository (paragraph 19-19).

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches: transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having the shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file (paragraph 47, paragraph 65, lines 1-5).

As per claim 18, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches: receiving a query from a querying user and transmitting an identification of a shared file satisfying the query to the querying user (paragraphs 19-20).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues prior art of record does not teach transmitting a client-side application to a file sharing user. Examiner finds Adams does teach this at [0023], as purchasing side user interface, [0027], as program modules may be located in both local and remote computer storage media and client nodes may behave as server nodes, [0070], each user computer may function with some, or all or none of the DMCHP

functionality and the purchasing side UI may be provided in a distributed manner in user computers.

Applicant argues prior art of record does not teach client-side application generating metadata. Examiner finds Adams does teach this at [0042], as user a can set price to download digital content, [0043], digital rights owner may chose to set different prices for different users for example high traffic high quality providers, Figure 2, reference number 210 : metadata repository.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2167

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2167

Susan Rayyan
August 17, 2008